CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Christ over the Beasts and the Agnus Dei: Two multivalent panels on the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses
Authors	Ó Carragáin, Éamonn
Publication date	1986-05-05
Original Citation	Ó Carragáin, É (1986) 'Christ over the Beasts and the Agnus Dei: Two Multivalent Panels on the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses', in Szarmach, P. E. and Oggins, V. D. (eds)., Sources of Anglo-Saxon culture, Symposium on the Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University. pp. 377-403. isbn: 0918720680
Type of publication	Book chapter;Conference item
Rights	© 1986 by the Board of the Medieval Institute, Kalamazoo, Michigan
Download date	2026-10-31 16:52:31
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/14874

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

unrepresented in the early Middle Ages. See further Robert Eisler, "Jesus Among the Animals by Moretto da Brescia," *Art in America,* 23 (1935) 137–40.

25. It is interesting to note that the "figure-eight" ear is used by the sculptor to represent the human ear, as is seen in the Paul-Anthony panel directly below Christ with the Beasts.

26. See *Rev. Art Chrét,* III (1892), fig. p. 135 (citation as in Princeton Index of Christian Art).

27. F. Cabrol, *Dict.* III[2] (1914), fig. 3090 (reference as in Princeton Index of Christian Art).

28. See Ernest T. DeWald, "The Art of the Scriptorium of Einsiedeln," *Scripta Helvetica,* 5 (1943), Plate XI.

29. Book cover, Paris, BN MS. lat. 10514.

Christ over the Beasts and the Agnus Dei: Two Multivalent Panels on the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses

ÉAMONN Ó CARRAGÁIN

Gerald Bonner and I are committed to write, for the forthcoming study of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses, a joint chapter entitled "The Spirituality of the Crosses." The question which our chapter will try to answer is, "In what ways do the iconographic programs of these crosses provide evidence of the spiritual life of the communities which erected the crosses?" In the present paper, I shall discuss one of the problems which need to be faced in any attempt to approach this question.[1]

A chapter on "the spirituality of the crosses" must build upon iconographic and stylistic studies. For example, any theories about the spirituality of the crosses must be very tentative indeed until Rosemary Cramp and Robert T. Farrell arrive at their conclusions about how the fragments of the Ruthwell Cross should be reconstructed, and about the artistic and historical relationships between the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses. On the Bewcastle Cross, a panel apparently representing John the Baptist bearing the Agnus Dei occurs above a panel representing Christ being adored by beasts. Between the two panels there is a runic inscription, "gessus kristtus,"[2] which could refer to either panel or to both. On the Ruthwell Cross, as at present reconstructed, a similar panel, apparently representing John the Baptist bearing the Agnus Dei,[3] is likewise placed above a panel representing Christ being adored by beasts. Does the Bewcastle Cross, in which the "Agnus Dei" panel is clearly placed above that representing Christ over the beasts, provide us with valid confirmatory evidence that the present reconstruction of the Ruthwell Cross is the true one? It is not impossible

that the Ruthwell "Agnus Dei" panel, on a separate stone from the panel representing Christ adored by the beasts, should originally have been reversed. It may originally have stood above the panel (placed on the other side of the cross as it is now reconstructed) which represents the penitent sinner washing the feet of Christ.[4] Such a rearrangement of the cross could not but have a drastic effect on our interpretation of the spiritual themes of the Ruthwell Cross. The juxtaposition of the "Agnus Dei" panel and that representing Christ adored by beasts on the west side of the Bewcastle Cross suggests nevertheless that the present reconstruction of the Ruthwell Cross is, in this particular, correct. I shall in this paper proceed on the assumption that at Ruthwell, as at Bewcastle, the "Agnus Dei" panel stood from the beginning above the "Christ over the Beasts" panel. However, only the technical studies of Cramp and Farrell can provide the detailed evidence needed to decide such matters.

Our chapter must therefore logically come later in the study than, and be dependent on, the chapters on the archaeology of the crosses and on the stylistic relationships of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses. But an effort to assess the spirituality of the crosses must cope with problems distinct from those of the archaeologist or the art historian. I propose briefly to examine one of these problems. Our ruminations on such matters are still very much "work in progress." However, even the effort to state the problem may be useful, in that it may prompt other scholars to restate the question in a more searching form, or to arrive at more convincing conclusions.

The problem I wish to raise is that the communities which had the monuments erected may well have related a panel to their spiritual lives in several different ways at once. One spiritual use need not in any way preclude other uses; and if in the end we go so far as to state that one spiritual use was primary, it would be wise to do so in the clear awareness that early medieval monks are likely to have been not at all exclusive in such a matter. The reverse, in fact, was probably true: they are likely to have valued figural representations which were relevant to as many facets of their lives (individual and communal) as possible. In a famous passage, St. Gregory the Great wrote that a commentator on Holy Scripture should take every opportunity of digressing from his main theme so as to incorporate other edifying material into his commentary where he felt that such a digression would provide material of spiritual value to his readers or hearers. Gregory used the image of a river, always ready to wander from its course to fill up any neighboring valley which might present itself.[5] Gregory's idea is clearly relevant, *mutatis mutandis,* to the planning of an important religious monument. The concerns of an early medieval monastic patron are likely

to have differed markedly from those of a modern scholar anxious to set forth a single coherent theme which can be abstracted from a series of figure-sculptures and to present that as the "iconographic program" of the series. The monastic patron may have been much less interested in any single theme which can be seen to run from panel to panel, and much more interested in how the various panels, and the Cross as a whole, could be seen by members of his monastery to reflect and inspire some of the most important aspects of their community life.

Panels, in short, may have been intended to be "multivalent"—to relate simultaneously to several aspects of the spiritual life of an individual or of a community. I wish to consider the two panels common to the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses, because they seem to me to be "multivalent" in this way. The people who erected the crosses are likely to have felt that these panels referred at once to several different scriptural texts and to several different liturgical ceremonies and seasons. I shall argue that the people who erected the crosses would not have seen one interpretation of these panels as excluding other, equally relevant ones.

I. The Principle of Multivalence in the "Christ over the Beasts" Panels on the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses

The "Christ over the Beasts" panel occupies a central position on the west side of the Bewcastle Cross. I would agree with Robert T. Farrell, who argues that the similar panel which occupies a central position on the north side of the Ruthwell Cross originally faced west also: as Farrell points out, this would have meant that on both crosses the figure of Christ would originally have been presented as "coming out of the East" (see Farrell, above, Note 6). The Ruthwell panel was provided with an inscription which indicates how the Ruthwell community felt the panel should be interpreted: "IHS XPS IVDEX AEQVITATIS: BESTIAE ET DRACONES COGNOUERVNT IN DESERTO SALVATOREM MVNDI" ("Jesus Christ the judge of equity. The animals and serpents recognized the Saviour of the world in the desert").[6] The inscription directs our attention to three important themes: (a) Christ as "judge of equity"; (b) the recognition of Christ as "the Saviour of the world"; (c) the "beasts and dragons" who recognize Christ in the desert.

Fritz Saxl and Meyer Schapiro have fully explored the importance of "life in the desert" (a *topos* seen as particularly relevant to the monastic life) as a theme on the Ruthwell Cross: the theme is emphasized, for example, in the panel immediately below "Christ over the Beasts," which represents

the Egyptian monks, Saints Paul and Anthony, breaking bread in the desert, and is inscribed "SCS PAVLVS ET ANTONIVS FREGERVNT PANEM IN DESERTO."[7] Saxl and Schapiro have also set forth the verbal parallels in the psalter and in the Acts of the Apostles to the phrase "IVDEX AEQVITATIS."[8] Meyer Schapiro, in particular, has emphasized that the theme of the recognition of Christ by the beasts has its origin in visions of Messianic harmony between the human and natural worlds which go back to the prophecies of Isaiah.[9] Recent research has suggested that there may have been an early monastic enclosure at Ruthwell.[10] In any effort to understand the part the "Christ over the Beasts" panel (and its inscription) may have played in the spiritual life of a community at Ruthwell, two scriptural texts become preeminent, because they were given particularly prominent and relevant liturgical uses. Such liturgical uses must have affected the way in which the Ruthwell monks imagined the "Christ over the Beasts" panels on their cross.

My argument in this paper will depend on the assumption that because the liturgy constituted *the* work of a monastery, liturgical texts were by their nature very different from literary texts. The importance of the liturgy is indicated by the names used for it: *officium divinum* or *opus Dei;* and an immediate indication of its central role in monastic life can be gained by considering how many of the chapters of the Benedictine Rule (and other monastic rules, earlier and later) are devoted to prescribing what texts should be sung, and when.[11] Literary texts (say, patristic commentaries on Scripture) were used primarily for private meditation, *lectio divina:* a detail in them might have meant a lot to one man; but they could have hardly meant as much to every member of a community. Liturgical texts, on the other hand, were communally sung; those sung daily or weekly, or on great feasts such as Good Friday, must have been seen as familiar landmarks, spacing out a monk's life in the community. It was by the liturgical services that a monk counted the hours: these services were as regular as clockwork, or at least as regular as could be managed in a world without clocks. Thus individual liturgical texts literally shaped the life of a monk. It is difficult to find appropriate analogies in modern secular life: perhaps, *mutatis mutandis,* the morning drive to work, or the recurrence of an important lecture one day each week, or the firm's annual stock-taking exercise, are the closest available. It follows that the significance or connotation of a liturgical text must have been determined by its liturgical uses as well as (and almost as much as) the literal denotations of its words.

The most relevant guides to the meaning of a given liturgical text are (a) the other texts used with it that day; and (b) the liturgical actions which

accompanied the singing of the text. Liturgical performance is for literary scholars a particularly fascinating phenomenon, because it continually involved the deconstruction and reconstruction of scriptural texts: deconstruction, in that texts were taken out of their original contexts, so that their meaning was thereby altered, often drastically (Old Testament texts, for example, were placed in new contexts which made it impossible to read them except as prefiguring Christianity); reconstruction, because texts were recombined into varied new conjunctions, controlled by the shape of the liturgical year. As we shall argue, a monk or a nun would have seen references to Christ in the desert from the perspective of the Lenten season, when the Church each year symbolically accompanied Christ into the desert to fast, pray, and overcome temptation. This spiritual aspect of the Lenten season may be one reason for the emphasis on the "IN DESERTO" theme on the north side of the Ruthwell Cross. Because liturgical performance was central to the life of a monk or a nun, scriptural events would have merged in his or her imagination with the ways in which the community publicly re-enacted these events each year, each month, each week and perhaps each day. Liturgical performance gave to each liturgical text a dramatic context which must never be forgotten when considering its meaning.

With these considerations in mind, let us consider the two texts whose liturgical uses make them of primary importance for the "Christ over the Beasts" panels at Ruthwell and at Bewcastle. The first text is Verse 13 of Psalm 90 (Latin numbering): "Super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis et conculcabis leonem et draconem" ("Thou shalt walk upon the asp and the basilisk: and thou shalt trample under foot the lion and dragon").[12] All scholars agree that the panel (whatever its other associations) represents Christ during his sojourn in the desert at the beginning of his public ministry – the episode summarized in St. Mark's Gospel as follows: "And he was in the desert forty days and forty nights, and was tempted by Satan. And he was with beasts: and the angels ministered unto him" (Mark 1:13). The primary reference of the phrase "IN DESERTO" in the inscription to the panel is clearly to Christ's sojourn in the desert. But Christ's forty-day fast in the desert would have been re-enacted yearly, in the liturgical life of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle communities, in forty days of Lenten fasting. At the beginning of this season, on the first Sunday of Lent, St. Matthew's account of Christ's fast in the desert and of his victory over the devil's temptations was read at Mass (Matthew 4:1–11). In this lection, Psalm 90:12 is quoted by the devil in his second temptation, when he urges Christ to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the Temple: "For it is written: 'That he hath given his angels charge over thee, and in their hands shall they

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK

bear thee up, lest perhaps thou dash thy foot against a stone'" (Matthew 4:6-7). Patristic commentaries, both on the Gospel accounts and on Psalm 90, naturally interpreted the following verse of Psalm 90, in which the Messiah tramples on the beasts and dragons, as a prefiguration of the way in which Christ rejected this temptation.[13]

In 1944, Meyer Schapiro pointed out that St. Matthew's account of Christ's temptations in the desert was used as a Lenten reading, and Robert T. Farrell, in a paper published in 1978, brought out the importance of this idea.[14] The practical relevance of Christ's sojourn in the desert would have been made clear to the Ruthwell community by the fact that Matthew 4:1-11 was read at Mass on the first Sunday in Lent. The first Sunday in Lent, *Dominica in Caput Quadragesimae,* was of primary importance: the liturgical readings and responsories for that day established both the rationale and the atmosphere for the ensuing season. The other scriptural texts adduced by Saxl and Schapiro are indeed relevant to the panels; but because Psalm 90 was actually quoted in the liturgical lection which described Christ's desert ordeal, a monastic community would have been particularly sensitive to any visual or verbal reference to it. It is not at all that Psalm 90 would exclude reminiscences of the other texts; but its liturgical prominence must have given that psalm a special place in the imagination of a monastic community. The sung texts (introit psalm, gradual, tract, offertory and communion) for the first Sunday in Lent were all taken from Psalm 90: it must have been very difficult for a monk or nun to imagine Christ in the desert without thinking also of the psalm so closely united with Matthew 4:1-11 by the liturgy.[15] Reminiscences of texts which had less prominence in the liturgical life of the community would have, as it were, clustered around the texts which had the greatest liturgical importance. The relevance of other texts would indeed have been appreciated; but they would hardly have had quite the same resonance for monastic audiences as those texts which were central to their communal life.

In the life of a monk or nun, Lent had a greater significance than any other liturgical season. St. Benedict had laid down that "the life of a monk ought at all times to be Lenten in its character."[16] It is relevant therefore to point out that Psalm 90 was prescribed by the Benedictine Rule for compline every evening of the year.[17] If the Ruthwell and Bewcastle communities followed the Rule of St. Benedict, or the Roman custom, in this particular, they would have sung Psalm 90 each evening as part of their preparations against "the terror of the night" ("non timebis a terrore nocturno" [Psalm 90:5]); they would therefore have been reminded, nightly, of the fulfilment of Psalm 90, in Christ's victory over temptation in the

desert. It is therefore interesting that representations of Christ over the beasts (Psalm 90:13) often occur, as Professor Farrell has pointed out above, on terra-cotta lamps: the lamps were presumably used at night-prayers, during which Psalm 90 would have been recited, or to light the way to bed immediately afterwards. Monks or nuns would each night have been reminded of their kinship, as individuals and as a community, with Christ who had withdrawn from the world to fast and pray "IN DESERTO." A monastic community must therefore have been particularly ready to respond to any association between Psalm 90 and a scene in which Christ was victorious in the desert.

But it is unlikely that the sculptors at Ruthwell and at Bewcastle intended Psalm 90, important as it was, to be the only association in the minds of those who looked at the "Christ over the Beasts" panels on their crosses. While clearly referring, in both panels, to visual representations of Psalm 90:13, the sculptors fundamentally altered the appearance and so the significance of the "Christ over the Beasts" panels on both crosses. If the sculptors were familiar with representations of the verse in which Christ, sometimes clad in armor, often bore the Cross as his weapon and trampled on a lion, a dragon, an asp, a basilisk or some combination of these beasts,[18] then it is highly significant that the sculptors completely avoided such heroic details and represented Christ on each cross with his right hand raised in blessing and with a scroll in his left hand. As Robert T. Farrell has pointed out above, the beasts at Ruthwell and Bewcastle may or may not have their paws raised in prayer or adoration. But it is highly interesting that they cannot definitely be identified as asps, basilisks, lions, or dragons—nor even, as Farrell has correctly emphasized, as swine. In the light of Farrell's discussion, it would seem that the sculptors at Ruthwell and Bewcastle were not concerned to suggest particular species of animals; in each case, their primary concern seems to have been to represent, simply, "two animals."

This brings us to the second text which, I wish to argue, the Ruthwell and Bewcastle sculptors wanted their communities to recall when they looked at the "Christ over the Beasts" panels. As long ago as 1944, Meyer Schapiro suggested that the Old Latin version of Habbakuk, Chapter 3 might be relevant to the "Christ over the Beasts" panel at Ruthwell.[19] But, apparently not realizing the liturgical importance of Habbakuk, Chapter 3, he simply listed this text in a footnote along with other texts, and so the importance of the passage for the interpretation of the panels was not realized. The Old Latin version of the Canticle of Habbakuk was sung every Friday morning at lauds. Bede wrote a commentary on the canticle for an unnamed

nun: in it he naturally follows the Old Latin text, and begins by emphasizing the symbolic significance of singing it every Friday:

> Canticum prophetae Abacuc, quod tibi exponi petisti, dilectissima in Christo soror, sacramenta dominicae passionis maximo pronuntiat. Vnde et consuetudine sanctae universalis et apostolicae ecclesiae sexta sabbati, qua eadem passio conpleta est, solet in laudibus matutinis per singulas ebdomadas sollemniter repeti.[20]
>
> The canticle of the prophet Habbacuc, of which, beloved sister in Christ, you asked for an exposition, prophesies above all the sacred events of the Lord's Passion. Therefore, and by the tradition of the holy, universal and apostolic Church, on the sixth day from the Sabbath [Friday], on which that same Passion was brought to completion, it is customary to repeat it solemnly each week, at the morning service of praise [lauds].

I quote the beginning of the canticle from the Vespasian Psalter:

> Domine audivi auditum tuum et timui:
> Consideravi opera tua et expavi.
> *In medio duorum animalium innotesceris:*
> Dum adpropiaverint anni *cognosceris;*
> Dum advenerit tempus ostenderis in eo.
> Dum conturbata fuerit anima mea in ira,
> misericordiae memor eris.
> Deus a Libano veniet,
> et sanctus de monte umbroso et condenso.
> Operuit caelos majestas ejus
> et laudi ejus plena est terra.
>
> Lord, I have heard your voice and been afraid:
> I have considered your works and been terrified.
> *In the midst of two animals you will be recognized:*
> When the years come to pass *you will be known;*
> When the time comes, you will be revealed in it.
> When my soul is totally shaken in [your?] anger,
> you will remember mercy.
> The Lord will come from Lebanon,
> and the holy one from a shaded, thickly-wooded hill.
> His majesty has overspread the heavens,
> and the earth is filled with his praise.[21]

At Ruthwell and at Bewcastle, the sculptors have encouraged reminiscence of the Canticle of Habbakuk in various ways. They used the verb "cognoscere" in the inscription (COGNOUERVNT IN DESERTO). As Robert T. Farrell has demonstrated in his article, it is uncertain whether the animals adore Christ or pray to him; but their attitude certainly suggests that they recognize him. The sculptors seem to have tried to make them as unspecific as possible—simply "two animals." The sculptors presented Christ, not as trampling down upon, but as recognized by the animals. On both crosses, the heads of the animals converge: their bodies are represented as sloping inwards towards each other, and fill the outward corners of the bottom of each panel. Thus the sculptors have suggested that the bodies of the animals extend outward, on either side of the towering figures of Christ who is, to this extent, "in medio duorum animalium." A more obvious representation of the animals on either side of the figure of Christ on each cross would have had two serious disadvantages. As the crosses were so slender, each figure of Christ would have had to be made unacceptably thin or small. Second, and more important, the multivalence of the panels would have been destroyed. It was by presenting the two animals below the feet of Christ yet recognizing him that the sculptors managed to combine a reference to Psalm 90 with a reference to the Canticle of Habbakuk.

Both Psalm 90 and the Canticle of Habbakuk were used together during one very important ceremony—the ceremony of readings on Good Friday. On Good Friday, Mass was not celebrated. Instead, at the ninth hour (3 P.M.), the hour at which, according to the synoptic Gospels, Christ died on the Cross, there began a service of readings and solemn prayers; this ceremony ended with the veneration of the Cross. During the eighth century, a communion service, the "Mass of the Presanctified," began to be added to the original "aliturgical" service of readings, after the veneration of the Cross.[22] The first reading in this solemn ceremony was an Old Testament prophecy of the Passion (Hosea 6:1–6); and this was followed by the singing of responsories based on the opening verses of the Canticle of Habbakuk.[23] Thus, writing about A.D. 394, St. Jerome stated that the common people saw the phrase "in medio duorum animalium innotesceris" as referring to Christ, who is recognized between two thieves on the Cross; Jerome himself, as we shall see, preferred more learned interpretations of the phrase.[24] This popular association of the canticle with the Crucifixion probably indicates that the canticle was, already in the fourth century, intimately associated with the Good Friday liturgy.

What for Jerome was merely a popular tradition was for Bede of central importance. Bede gives far more prominence than Jerome had done to the

idea that "in medio duorum animalium innotesceris" refers to Christ on the Cross, and so interprets the phrase primarily in the light of its liturgical use (on Good Friday and on every other Friday). Bede relates the phrase to two episodes: the Transfiguration, in which the three disciples (Peter, James and John) had recognized Christ in the midst of Moses and Elijah; and the Crucifixion itself, in which Christ was recognized between two thieves. Bede emphasizes that these two episodes were related: at the Transfiguration, Christ revealed to the disciples that he was to suffer, die and rise again, while the voice from heaven revealed to them that Christ was the Son of God. Likewise, the Crucifixion is seen by Bede as a revelation of Christ's twofold nature as man and God:

> Potest etiam in medio duorum latronum non inconuenienter accipi, inter quos crucifixus moriendo innotescebat, quia homo erat. Obscurato autem sole, terra commota, et ceteris quae euangelium narrat circa crucem facta miraculis, innotescebat quia Deus erat. Interpellando ipse patrem pro interfectoribus suis, quam pius esset innotescebat.[25]
>
> Indeed, [the phrase] can be not unsuitably taken as "in the midst of two thieves"; for by dying on the Cross between those, he made known that he was a man. However, by the darkening of the sun, the earthquake, and the other miracles which the Gospel narrates as performed about the Cross, he made known that he was God. He made known how merciful he was, when he himself interceded with his Father for his executioners.

The crucial factor uniting Transfiguration to Crucifixion in Bede's imagination is that both scenes involve an audience of the faithful. For Bede, the important element in each scene is not Moses and Elias or the two thieves, but the onlookers to whom, in each scene, Christ's twofold nature is revealed. As we shall see, this is important both for the interpretation of the "Christ over the Beasts" panel, and for that of the neighboring panels on the same side of the Ruthwell Cross. At this stage, the important point to note is that Bede's emphasis on the Crucifixion as an epiphany of Christ's nature is quite consistent with, and indeed was probably suggested by, the liturgical uses of the canticle.

In the Good Friday liturgy, the Habbakuk responsory was followed by the second Old Testament reading, the divine commands to Moses about how the Paschal lamb was to be prepared and eaten (Exodus 12:1–11). In all the surviving antiphonaries, this second reading is followed by the tract

"Eripe me" (from Psalm 139); but up to the end of the eighth century the tract after this second Old Testament reading was none other than the "Qui habitat," Psalm 90. This tract was later transferred to the first Sunday in Lent, a Sunday on which, as we have already seen, the antiphons of the Mass were already dominated by Psalm 90.[26] After the "Qui habitat" came the solemn reading of the Passion according to St. John, and the adoration of the Cross.

It would seem, therefore, that in presenting their "Christ over the Beasts" panels as multivalent images which recall at once the Canticle of Habbakuk and Psalm 90, the Ruthwell and Bewcastle sculptors intended a direct reference to the Good Friday liturgy. A monk or nun of the Ruthwell community would probably have recited Psalm 90 each evening, and the Canticle of Habbakuk every Friday morning: but the image on the Ruthwell Cross would have reminded them of the ceremony in which both texts were sung by the community directly after one another (for in a monastery the whole community would have participated in the responsories, while the Old Testament lections would have been assigned to a single lector) – the commemoration of the moment of Christ's death on Good Friday.

On both the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses, Christ is represented as facing out towards the spectator, his right hand raised in blessing and his left hand grasping a scroll. Such a presentation of Christ may be influenced by the Canticle of Habbakuk. The scroll can possibly be interpreted in the light of St. Jerome's commentary on "in medio duorum animalium." The central theme of Jerome's commentary on the phrase is the way in which God, and the mystery of the Trinity, was progressively revealed in Scripture, first in the Old Testament, then in the New. Having surveyed the relevant Old Testament texts (in particular the way in which God used to speak to Israel "de medio duorum cherubim," over the ark of the covenant [Exodus 25:22]), Jerome briefly refers to the popular interpretation of the phrase as referring to Christ on the Cross between the two thieves. But Jerome saw the phrase primarily in ecclesiological terms. Thus the climax of his interpretation relates the phrase to the way Christ was made known, in the life of the primitive Church, by the combined testimony of the Old and New Testaments:

> Qui autem melius, hoc dicunt, quod in prima Ecclesia quae de circumcisione fuit, et de praeputio congregata, duobus populis se hinc inde cingentibus, intellectus sit Saluator et creditus. Sunt qui duo animalia, duo intellegant testamenta, nouum et uetus, quae uere

animantia sint, quae uitalia, quae spirent et in quorum medio Dominus cognoscatur.[27]

But those who [understand the matter] better, say that the Saviour is to be understood and believed in the primitive Church, which was brought together both from the circumcised and from the uncircumcised—the Saviour surrounding himself, on the one side and on the other, by two peoples. There are those who interpret the two animals as the two Testaments, Old and New, which can be said to be truly life-giving and full of life, to breathe [the Spirit], and in the midst of which the Lord may be known.

What is common to Bede's and to Jerome's interpretations is their readiness to interpret the two animals as referring to human beings (Bede's use of Moses and Elias and of the two thieves, and Jerome's use of the Jews and Gentiles, whose coming together constituted the Church). The scroll in Christ's left hand, in each panel, seems designed to suggest that the animals below are to be taken as standing for the ways in which Christ was to be known through the Church's teaching (as in Jerome's commentary). The upraised paws of the animals, if indeed they *could* be gestures of prayer or adoration, would also reinforce this symbolic level of meaning.

The right hand of Christ, raised in blessing, is another significant detail in each of the two "Christ over the Beasts" panels. The inscription on the Ruthwell Cross combines, as we have seen, three ideas: Christ as judge, the recognition of Christ as Saviour, and his recognition by animals in the desert. In the Canticle of Habbakuk, these three ideas are strikingly combined. Not only does the canticle present Christ as revealed between two animals; throughout the canticle the ideas of judgment and salvation, of advent and eschatology, are repeatedly juxtaposed. In the opening verses, quoted above, the prophet moves from fear at "the Lord's voice" ("auditum tuum") to trust that he will remember mercy ("misericordiae memor eris"). This progression is repeated throughout the canticle: both the canticle and the panels on the two crosses are concerned with the interrelationship of fear and trust, and of judgment and blessing.[28]

The association of the Canticle of Habbakuk with lauds, the office sung at daybreak, is interesting. As we have seen, Robert T. Farrell has argued (see above, Note 6) that the "Christ over the Beasts" panels on both crosses originally faced west, as the one at Bewcastle still does. But this would have meant that a monk at Ruthwell or Bewcastle, when he left the monastic church after lauds on Friday morning, would have seen the rising sun behind the "Christ over the Beasts" panel. He could hardly fail to be reminded

of such verses in the canticle he had just sung as

Operuit caelos majestas ejus,
et laudi ejus plena est terra.
Splendor ejus sicut lumen erit,
cornua sunt in manibus ejus:
ibi confirmata est virtus gloriae ejus,
et posuit claritatem firmam fortitudini suae.[29]

His majesty has óverspread the heavens,
and the earth is filled with his praise.
His glory will be as a radiance,
there are horns in his hands:
there is the power of his glory established,
and there has he set a powerful light for his valour.

It may not be a coincidence that the corresponding panel on the opposite side of the Ruthwell Cross depicts the healing of the blind man, and that the inscription to this panel quotes the beginning of the appropriate lection, John 9:1-38. If Robert Farrell's theory about the orientation of the Ruthwell Cross is correct, this panel would have occupied the central position on the east side of the cross. It would then have been seen daily against the setting sun, and the Ruthwell community might possibly have been reminded of the importance in that lection of images of light and of approaching darkness:

Me oportet operari opera eius qui misit me, donec dies est: venit nox, quando nemo potest operari: quamdiu sum in mundo, lux sum mundi.[30]

I must work the works of him that sent me, whilst it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work. As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.

Again, the multivalence of the symbolism embodied in the panels should be emphasized. What we might term "orientational" symbolism would not have interfered with the other symbolic patterns to which these panels contribute; but it would have helped the Ruthwell community, and those who looked at the Bewcastle Cross, to relate to their daily or weekly lives any wider symbolic significance which the panels had. If monastic life was shaped and marked out by the hours of the divine office, we should not be surprised to find references on the crosses to the hours at which canticles were sung, or to find Gospel lections represented in positions which brought out

the symbolic importance of temporal references within them.

Indeed, if the Ruthwell Cross was oriented in the way Farrell has suggested, there may have been a practical liturgical purpose behind such orientation. If at certain times it was thought proper to erect a temporary altar at the cross, it would have been placed against the west side. In this way, the celebrant could correctly face east during Mass. Such an altar would have covered the "Return from Egypt" panel; immediately above it, however, the "Paul and Anthony" panel would have been at least partially visible; and the celebration of Mass or the distribution of the Eucharist (for example, during the "Mass of the Presanctified" on Good Friday, a ceremony which I shall discuss in relation to the two crosses in a forthcoming article), would have given a very practical application to the "eucharistic triptych" (Paul and Anthony/Christ over the Beasts/Agnus Dei).

The orientation suggested by Farrell may have facilitated the liturgical use of the crosses; it would certainly have enriched the devotional associations of the "Christ over the Beasts" panel on each cross. It has long been recognized that these panels refer to Messianic harmony between men and beasts; and the earthly paradise was known to have existed in the East. The Ruthwell inscription gives an eschatological interpretation to the panel; and Scripture foretold that Christ would come like lightning from the East ("sicut enim fulgur exit ab oriente" [Matthew 24:27]) to judge the world. On both crosses, this truth is presented with a noble fusion of urgency and confidence: Christ may be represented as judge, but his right hand is raised to bless the onlookers on whom he gazes so majestically. This confident faith, movingly represented on both crosses, has at Ruthwell been also recorded in words. The Ruthwell community waited in the desert to recognize Christ as "IVDEX AEQVITATIS."

On the Bewcastle Cross, the "Christ over the Beasts" and "Agnus Dei" panels would also, as at Ruthwell, have been visible above a temporary altar. If Mass was ever celebrated at the cross, the theme of "recognizing Christ," which as we shall argue unites both panels, would have been made plain by liturgical action.[31] It is possibly in such practical liturgical use of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses that an explanation may be found of the close correspondence between the upper parts of the two monuments, while the lower panels are different on each cross. When a temporary altar was placed before each cross, the monument would have functioned as a reredos for the altar. Over the altar, at both Ruthwell and Bewcastle, the iconography would have been the same: and we shall see that in each case it would have been clearly eucharistic.

II. The Principle of Multivalence in the "Agnus Dei" Panels on the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses

On both the Ruthwell and the Bewcastle crosses, the panel directly above "Christ over the Beasts" represents a human figure bearing a lamb, presumably the Lamb of God (Agnus Dei). There are at least four possible spiritual contexts for the panels:

(i) The first is that of private devotion: Edmund Bishop long ago pointed out that the words "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis" came to England as part of the Litany of the Saints, and seem to have been used as a private prayer from about the year 700.[32] Such a devotion would have been reflected with particular appropriateness on a monument associated with Good Friday: we have seen above how, in the Good Friday readings, Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was associated with the paschal lamb of Exodus.

(ii) The second possible context is baptism: it was at the Jordan, where he was baptizing converts, that John the Baptist acclaimed Christ as the Lamb of God. It is only in St. John's Gospel that John the Baptist is described as acknowledging Christ as the Agnus Dei; and in that Gospel, John the Baptist is not described as baptizing Christ. Nevertheless, the scene takes place in Bethania across the Jordan, "where John was baptizing" (John 1:28). St. John's Gospel used material in this scene which clearly corresponded to the synoptic accounts in which the Baptist baptized Jesus. Thus, the account of the Baptist hailing Christ as the Lamb of God in John's Gospel was universally harmonized with the synoptic accounts of the baptism of Jesus.

(iii) A third possible context for the "Agnus Dei" panel is the Eucharist: Pope Sergius I introduced the words "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis" into the Mass; they were chanted at the moment of the breaking of bread for Communion.[33] The importance of this innovation has been emphasized by Michel Andrieu:

> On sait combien, dans l'ancienne liturgie romaine, les prières directement adressées au Christ sont rares. Dans le Canon de la messe et dans l'oraison dominicale, c'est le Père tout-puissant, et lui seul, qu'invoque le célébrant, par les mérites et l'intercession du Sauveur. Brusquement, avec l'*Agnus Dei*, la prière prend une autre orientation: c'est vers la victime sainte que sont maintenant dirigées les supplications de l'assemblée.[34]

In the canon and communion of the Mass, during which prayers were almost entirely addressed directly to God the Father *through* Christ his Son, this direct petition to Christ was a striking innovation. This innovation in public worship is perhaps the most likely context for the single word which still survives of the inscription around the "Agnus Dei" panel, the plural verb "ADORAMVS."[35]

(iv) A fourth possible context is eschatological: in the fifth chapter of the Apocalypse of St. John, the triumph of the slain but risen Christ is celebrated in the symbol of the Lamb being adored by a multitude of the blessed.

Which of these contexts is most relevant to the crosses? The fact that the Agnus Dei prayer was used in private devotion suggests that certain members of the Ruthwell congregation may have responded to the panel in isolation, without reference to neighboring panels, as a devotional object in its own right. Such a response could have validly coexisted with baptismal, eucharistic or eschatological interpretations of the panel. The baptismal associations of the Agnus Dei are also very appropriate to the context of the panel on the Ruthwell Cross. The recognition of Christ as the Agnus Dei comes from the Gospel of St. John ("Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi" [John 1:29; cp. John 1:36]). St. John has transformed the synoptic accounts of Jesus' baptism into a threefold proclamation, by John the Baptist, of the divinity of Jesus:

> sed qui misit me baptizare in aqua, ille mihi dixit: Super quem videris Spiritum descendentem, et manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu sancto. Et ego vidi: et testimonium perhibui quia hic est Filius Dei. Altera die iterum stabat Ioannes, et ex discipulis eius duo. Et respiciens Iesum ambulantem, dicit: Ecce agnus Dei. (John 1:33–36)[36]

> But he who sent me to baptize with water said to me: He upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him, he it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw: and I gave testimony that this is the Son of God. The next day again John stood and two of his disciples. And beholding Jesus walking, he saith: Behold the Lamb of God.

The scene in the Gospel of St. John in which John the Baptist acknowledges Jesus as the Lamb of God combines a meditation on Christian baptism with a solemn declaration that Jesus is the Son of God. But the recognition of Christ's true nature seems to be an important devotional concern of the panels under discussion. On both crosses, the panel just below the Agnus

Dei emphasizes that even the "bestiae et dracones" recognized Christ as the Saviour of the world. At Ruthwell, as we shall see, this devotional theme is carried even further, by the "Paul and Anthony" and the "Return from Egypt" panels.

Bede wrote a whole homily on the lection from St. John's Gospel in which Christ is recognized as "the Lamb of God" by John the Baptist (John 1:29–34). The homily was intended for use on the Sunday after the Epiphany, the Sunday on which Christ's baptism was commemorated. The opening paragraph of this homily is an extended meditation on the various meanings of the title "Agnus Dei," and this passage is surely the *locus classicus* for understanding how an eighth-century monastic audience would have interpreted the Ruthwell and Bewcastle "Agnus Dei" panels.[37] What is very revealing is the relative space Bede devotes to the various interpretations of the title, and so the relative emphasis he places on each possible devotional perspective. Bede first contrasts the innocence of Christ, the second Adam, with the sin of the first (ll. 5–7). This leads naturally to the idea of the lamb (especially the lamb among wolves) as a symbol of threatened innocence (ll. 8–11). Bede begins the central part of his exposition (ll. 11–28) with the idea that Christians have been washed in the blood of the lamb (he quotes 1 Peter 1:18–19 and Apocalypse 1:5). In this passage, Bede fuses images of baptismal washing with images of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary; and mention of Calvary brings Bede to his central point: the daily re-enactment of Calvary in the Mass. The importance of this passage for the Ruthwell panel is very great. It shows that in Bede's mind the idea of the Agnus Dei, and the very idea of baptism, was intimately associated with the eucharistic sacrifice. This passage has, indeed, been adduced by G. G. Willis to show that Bede used the "Agnus Dei" chant (with its variant "peccata mundi," instead of St. John's "peccatum mundi") daily at the breaking of bread for communion:

> Non solum autem lauit nos a peccatis nostris in sanguine suo quando sanguinem suum dedit in cruce pro nobis uel quando unusquisque nostrum mysterio sacraesanctae passionis illius baptismi aqua ablutus est uerum etiam cotidie tollit peccata mundi lauatque nos a peccatis nostris cotidianis in sanguine suo cum eiusdem beatae passionis ad altare memoria replicatur cum panis et uini creatura in sacramentum carnis et sanguinis eius ineffabili spiritus sanctificatione transfertur sicque corpus et sanguis illius non infidelium manibus ad perniciem ipsorum funditur et occiditur sed fidelium ore suam sumitur in salutem.[38]

> Not only did he wash us from our sins in his blood when he gave his blood for us on the Cross, or when each one of us was washed in the water of baptism through the mystery of his sacred Passion: but indeed he daily takes away the sins of the world, and washes us from our daily sins in his blood, when the memory of his blessed Passion is re-enacted at the altar, and when what was created bread and wine is transformed into the sacrament of his body and blood, through the ineffable hallowing of the spirit. And in this way his body and blood is no longer spilled and slain by the hands of infidels to their damnation, but is received by the mouths of the faithful to their salvation.

Bede then rounds off his exposition of the title "Agnus Dei" by referring to the sacrifice of a paschal lamb yearly in the Old Law (to commemorate the paschal lamb of Exodus) as a figure of Calvary (ll. 28–32). But this leads him back finally to his central theme: how such Old Testament rites were fulfilled when Christ, the priest according to the order of Melchisedech, offered himself to his Father under the form of bread and wine (ll. 32–36).[39]

If devotion to the Agnus Dei was primarily seen by Bede in the context of the Eucharist, this seems also to be the context primarily in the minds of the Ruthwell sculptors. In the context they provided for their "Agnus Dei" panel, eucharistic associations predominate. On the same side of the cross as the "Agnus Dei" panel, we have the figures of Saints Paul and Anthony, identified by the inscription as having "broken bread in the desert"; while between the "Paul and Anthony" panel and the "Agnus Dei" panel on Ruthwell, there is the figure of Christ recognized by the beasts. Anyone able to read the Ruthwell inscriptions would have recognized in the "fregerunt panem" of the "Paul and Anthony" panel a reference to the "fractio panis," the technical term for the breaking of bread for Communion at Mass.[40] Similarly, such a reader of Latin inscriptions would have been likely to recognize, in both the "fregerunt panem" phrase and in the phrase "cognoverunt ... Salvatorem mundi," attached to the panel of "Christ over the Beasts," the echo of the episode in St. Luke where the disciples on the road to Emmaus "recognize" the anonymous Christ "in the breaking of bread":

> accepit panem, et benedixit, ac fregit, et porrigebat illis. Et aperti sunt oculi eorum, et cognoverunt eum: et ipse evanuit ex oculis eorum.[41]
>
> [H]e took bread and blessed and brake and gave to them. And their eyes were opened: and they knew him. And he vanished out of their sight.

This scriptural passage is referred to during the Communion ceremony in the Stowe Missal, in a passage which makes perfectly clear that in eucharistic contexts there was an important connection between "knowing" the Lord ("cognoverunt") and the "fractio panis": "cognoerunt dominum. alleluia. in fractione panis. alleluia"[42] ("they knew the Lord. Alleluia. in the breaking of bread. Alleluia").

George Henderson has provided convincing evidence that the Ruthwell community is likely to have seen eucharistic significance in all of the surviving panels on this side of the cross. He has pointed out that the representation of the so-called "Flight into Egypt," below the "Paul and Anthony" panel, is more likely to have been seen as illustrating the prophecy quoted by St. Matthew apropos of Christ's sojourn in Egypt: "Out of Egypt I have called my son."[43] The panel can therefore be seen to represent the Christ Child re-enacting the crossing of the desert during the Exodus, when the Jews were fed with manna from heaven. Christ himself was the heavenly food which the manna of the Exodus had prefigured.

What of the fourth, eschatological, context which I have suggested for the "Agnus Dei" panel? Eschatological ideas are evident in the panels which apparently flanked the "Agnus Dei" panel on the Ruthwell Cross. As Rosemary Cramp suggested in 1978, there was probably an apocalypse scene on the crosspiece of the transom (directly above the "Agnus Dei" panel). She argued that at the crosspiece there was a representation of the apocalyptic Lamb, or perhaps of a *Majestas Domini*. This central figure would have been surrounded by the four Evangelist symbols, of which two still survive (St. John and his eagle above,[44] St. Matthew and his angel below). The scene would have represented the passage in the Apocalypse of St. John in which the Lamb and the throne are adored by the beasts and elders.[45] An eschatological perspective is also clearly implied by the inscription around the figure of Christ, "IVDEX AEQVITATIS," adored by the beasts.

George Henderson has pointed out that the probable existence of the apocalypse scene above the "Agnus Dei" panel would have made it unlikely that the "Agnus Dei" panel itself represented the same scene.[46] It is, however, important to note how natural would have been the transition from an "Agnus Dei" panel to the crosspiece which may have represented the adoration of that Lamb (or of Christ in majesty) by the beasts in the Apocalypse. The "Agnus Dei" chant was, as we have seen, from the late seventh century on sung in the Roman Mass while the consecrated bread

was being broken for distribution in the Eucharist. But from the earliest days of Christianity, the Eucharist had been seen to have eschatological implications. As the Eucharist had been prefigured by the feeding of Israel with manna in the desert, so the Eucharist itself was seen as a symbol of the complete communion of the Church with Christ which would only be realized with the second coming; while the failure to distinguish Christ's presence in the bread and wine would bring judgment upon the person who received the Eucharist in such an unworthy way:

> Quotiescumque enim manducabitis panem hunc, et calicem bibetis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis *donec veniat.* Itaque quicumque manducaverit panem hunc, vel biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini.... Qui enim manducat et bibit indigne, *iudicium sibi manducat et bibit: non diiudicans corpus Domini.*[47]
>
> For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord *until he come.* Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.... For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily *eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.*

This passage from 1 Corinthians comes directly after the classic description by St. Paul of the institution of the Eucharist (1 Corinthians 11:23–25). Verse 26, quoted above, is paraphrased in the words added by the scribe Moelcaich at the end of the formula of consecration in the ninth-century Irish Stowe Missal. Moelcaich expands the Pauline verse so as to bring out the eschatological significance of St. Paul's "donec veniat":

> in mei memoriam faciatis passionem meam predicabitis resurrectionem meam adnuntiabitis aduentum meum sperabitis donec iterum ueniam ad uos de celis.[48]
>
> You should do this in memory of me; you will proclaim my passion; you will announce my resurrection; you will hope for my coming until I come again to you from the heavens.

St. Paul implies that it will not be long before Christ returns in judgment; and it is clear that he sees the fate of the Christian at the Judgment as depending on whether he has recognized or discerned Christ in the Eucharist. The Ruthwell sculptors were evidently thinking along similar lines when they placed a panel depicting "IHS XPS IVDEX AEQVITATIS" directly above the panel in which Saints Paul and Anthony recognize Christ in

the breaking of bread. If Rosemary Cramp's theory about the iconography of the missing crosspiece is correct, the sculptors planned the upper part of this side of the cross so as to represent, in a different symbolic form, the same sequence of ideas. For the second time on this side of the cross, they linked a scene with eucharistic significance directly to an eschatological scene: they placed the panel in which John the Baptist recognizes Christ in symbolic form, as the Agnus Dei, directly under the crosspiece, in which the four evangelist-beasts of St. John's Apocalypse may have been represented as adoring the same Agnus Dei, now revealed in glory at the Last Judgment. The liturgical significance of the linking of the two panels would have been equally clear whether Christ was represented on the missing crosspiece as a glorified Agnus Dei, or "in propria figura" as the *Majestas domini.*

We may suggest, therefore, that while eucharistic associations are dominant in the context provided for the "Agnus Dei" panel on the Ruthwell Cross, all of the four main devotional uses of the Agnus Dei are relevant to the panel. Any one of them may have been important at various times to such members of the Ruthwell community as were in the habit of using their cross as an aid in their devotional lives. The Ruthwell sculptors seem to have intended their cross primarily for devotional use by a community. The way in which they conceived of the people who would use the cross as forming a community can be seen by examining the ordered progression which they embodied in the wording of the inscriptions on this side of the cross. Coming out of Egypt, the Christ Child is carried by "MARIA ET IO[SEPHVS]"—the inscription clearly referring to a pair of figures; another pair, "PAVLVS ET ANTONIVS," break the eucharistic loaf directly above. In this second panel, Christ is already recognized between two figures: and it is significant that the two animals who recognize Christ are placed just above the heads of (and thus visually related to) the figures of St. Paul and St. Anthony. But although a single pair of animals is represented in the "Christ over the Beasts" panel, the inscription refers to them in the plural as "BESTIAE ET DRACONES." The significance of the progression from singular to plural is made clear by the verbal reminiscence which, as Elisabeth Okasha has pointed out, probably lies behind the wording of the inscription:

> Glorificabit me bestia agri, draconcs et struthiones: quia dedi in deserto aquas, flumina in invio, ut darem potum populo meo, electo meo.[49]
>
> The beast of the field shall glorify me, the dragons and the ostriches: because I have given waters in the wilderness, rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, to my chosen.

By referring to the "BESTIAE ET DRACONES" in the plural, the sculptors recall, through them, "my people, my chosen" ("populo meo, electo meo") whom Christ feeds in the desert. No less an authority than Gregory the Great referred to "all the faithful" as "holy animals" fed by Christ in the Eucharist with his own body ("ut fideles omnes videlicet sancta animalia, carnis suae frumento reficeret").[50] The inscription for the panel directly above carries the pattern we have been examining one step futher, and completes it. The "ADORAMVS" which remains from the "Agnus Dei" inscription is not merely plural but in the first person. It seems to refer directly to the liturgical actions of the Ruthwell community. The inscription around the "Agnus Dei" panel possibly referred openly to the eucharistic significance of the Agnus Dei, and so to the eucharistic theme of "recognizing Christ" expressed in symbolic ways by the panels below. It was just such references to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, after all, which would have attracted the most diligent attentions of seventeenth-century iconoclasts out to destroy "idolatrous monuments"; ironically enough, it is possible that the "Agnus Dei" chant itself had been introduced at the moment of the breaking of bread as a practical refutation of iconoclastic tendencies in seventh-century Byzantium.[51] Like Paul and Anthony in the desert, the Ruthwell community would have adored Christ, the Agnus Dei, at the breaking of bread. Indeed, a community which saw the Eucharist as their daily spiritual bread could very aptly have summed up their liturgical life in the words "COGNOUERVNT IN DESERTO SALVATOREM MVNDI."

It will be our task, in examining the spiritual uses to which the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses may have been put, to be faithful to the fact that, in monastic spirituality, one devotional perspective could coexist quite naturally with another, and indeed with several others. The primary artistic virtue of the monastic tradition was the ability to weave around any theme a rich web of scriptural associations. For monks or nuns, it was not a tangled web. The shifting patterns of association may seem confusing to us, but for a monastic audience the liturgy itself would have controlled, articulated, and organized the various devotional perspectives. Monastic writers like Bede seem to have rejoiced precisely in the variety of perspectives available to them at any one time. They could do so without fear of their readers' being confused: the liturgy itself determined which perspective should be the dominant one, at any particular season, in the devotional life of their readers. The liturgical year was an ordered unity: from the perspective of any part of it, the reader could fittingly be reminded of the riches of the other seasons and their scriptural associations. Modern scholars are trained in a positivistic university tradition preoccupied with

what can be shown to be the single correct solution, and with excluding all else as false. But such training can make us unsympathetic to the very different aims and methods of the art of early medieval monasticism. We must indeed remain faithful to our responsibility to be clear and consistent, and to discriminate between associations which are more important and those which are less so; but we should also be careful not to foist our more cut-and-dried forms of thinking onto a culture whose artistic achievements depended on cultivating different virtues.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CORK.

Notes

1. I wish to thank scholars who read various parts and versions of this paper and made valuable suggestions as to how it should be improved, especially my colleagues at Cork, Jennifer O'Reilly and Terence O'Reilly; and, at Oxford, Malcolm Parkes and David Howlett. I also wish to thank the Blackfriars Community, Oxford, for allowing me to use their excellent theological library.

2. See R[aymond] I. Page, "The Bewcastle Cross," *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 4 (1960), 36–57 (at p. 38).

3. Paul Meyvaert has recently argued that the Agnus Dei is borne, in this panel (and perhaps also on the Bewcastle Cross), not by John the Baptist but by God the Father, the *Majestas Domini*: "An Apocalypse Panel on the Ruthwell Cross," *Medieval and Renaissance Studies: Proceedings of the Southeastern Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Summer 1978*, ed. Frank Tirro (Durham, N. C., 1982), pp. 3–32. This interpretation has been convincingly challenged by George Henderson in lectures at Cambridge and in a forthcoming paper, "The St. John the Baptist Panel on the Ruthwell Cross." I am grateful to Dr. Henderson for allowing me to read a typescript of this paper before publication.

4. Such a suggestion was made by Paul Meyvaert in a lecture given at Oxford in November 1980 and subsequently given at Cork.

5. Gregory, *Moralia sive Expositio in Job, Epistula Praevia ad Leandrum Hispalensem*, in *PL*, 75:509–16, at column 513.

6. Text and translation adapted from Elisabeth Okasha, *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge, 1971), p. 110.

7. Text adapted from Okasha, p. 110; see F[ritz] Saxl, "The Ruthwell Cross," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 6 (1943), 1–19 (at pp. 1–2 and p. 5); and Meyer Schapiro, "The Religious Meaning of the Ruthwell Cross," *Art Bulletin*, 26 (1944), 232–45 (at pp. 232–36).

8. Schapiro, p. 233, and Saxl, p. 1.

9. Schapiro, pp. 234–35; the close and suggestive verbal parallel in Isaiah 43:20 for "bestiae et dracones ... in deserto," identified by Elisabeth Okasha (p. 110), is discussed in the second part of this paper.

10. I rely on the evidence adduced by Paul Meyvaert, in the unpublished lecture already referred to.

11. *The Rule of St. Benedict,* ed. and trans. Justin McCann (London, 1952); and *La Règle de Saint Benoît,* ed. and trans. A. de Vogüé and J. Neufville, 6 vols., Sources Chrétiennes (Paris, 1971–72).

12. Quotations from the psalter and canticles throughout this article are taken from the Vespasian Psalter, ed. Henry Sweet, in *The Oldest English Texts,* EETS, O.S. 83 (London, 1885), pp. 183–420; other Biblical quotations are from *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam,* ed. Alberto Colunga and Laurentio Turrado (Madrid, 1965). All translations from Scripture are from *The Holy Bible* (Douay version) (London, 1914). Unless otherwise indicated, other translations are mine.

13. See Schapiro, p. 233 and n. 5; Saxl, p. 2.

14. Schapiro, pp. 238–39; Robert T. Farrell, "The Archer and Associated Figures on the Ruthwell Cross—A Reconsideration," in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England,* ed. Robert T. Farrell, British Archaeological Reports, 46 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 96–117 (at pp. 105–07).

15. In 1978, Farrell stated that he could not prove that Psalm 90 was liturgically used on the first Sunday in Lent in Bede's day, although he felt it to be "highly probable" that it was (p. 107). He was surely right in so thinking: verses from Psalm 90 are prescribed for the first Sunday in Lent in the earliest surviving Roman Mass-antiphonaries: see René-Jean Hesbert, ed., *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex* (Brussels, 1935), No. 40, pp. 52–55; see the discussion in Hesbert's Introduction, pp. l–lii, of the role of Psalm 90 in the successive chants assigned to the first Sunday in Lent. Matthew 4:1–11 is likewise found as the pericope for the first Sunday in Lent in all the earliest Roman lectionaries: see Theodor Klauser, ed., *Das römische "Capitulare Evangeliorum,"* Litnrgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen, 28 (Münster, Westphalia, 1935), pp. 19 (No. 56); 65 (No. 64); 107 (No. 60); 146 (No. 73); and 175 (No. 64). As Farrell points out, Matthew 4:1–11 is also given for the first Sunday in Lent in the *capitula lectionum,* of Neapolitan origin, found in the Lindisfarne Gospels: see Stefan Beissel, *Entstehung der Pericopen des Römischen Messbuches* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1907), p. 112. It is likely that Bede made use of this lectionary: see D. Hurst, ed., *Bedae Venerabilis Homiliarum Evangelii Libri II,* CCSL, Vol. 122 (Turnhout, 1965), pp. viii, ix–xvi; and G. G. Willis, "Early English Liturgy from Augustine to Alcuin," *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy,* Alcuin Club Collections, 50 (London, 1968), pp. 189–258 (at p. 215). For further examples of the early use of this lection, see Farrell, p. 107 and n. 29.

16. "Licet omni tempore vita monachi Quadragesimae debet observationem habere" (*Rule of St. Benedict,* Chap. 49; ed. McCann, pp. 114–15).

17. "Ad Completorios vero cotidie iidem psalmi repetantur: id est, quartus, nonagesimus, et centesimus trigesimus tertius" (*Rule of St. Benedict,* Chap. 18; ed. McCann, pp. 64–67). Benedict here was following the Roman order for singing

the psalms: see the note in Vogüé and Neufville, at Chapter 18, verse 19 (Vol. II, pp. 532–33).

18. On the traditional visual representation of Psalm 90:13, see Robert T. Farrell, above. It is interesting to speculate on how an Anglo-Saxon monk, who did not have an illustrated psalter, would have imagined the beasts of Psalm 90:13. The Vespasian Psalter (ed. Sweet, p. 320) glosses "aspidem" as "nedran," "basiliscum" as "fagwyrm," "leonem" as "leon" and "draconem" as "dracan."

19. Schapiro, p. 235, n. 21.

20. *Expositio Bedae Presbyteri in Canticum Abacuc Prophetae,* ed. J. E. Hudson, CCSL, Vol. 119B (Turnhout, 1983), pp. 376–409 (at p. 381); cf. *PL,* 91:1235–54 (at cols. 1235–37).

21. Text from the Vespasian Psalter, where the canticle is given the rubric "sexta feria" (Friday) (ed. Sweet, p. 407). Translation mine. On the liturgical use of the canticle, see *The Vespasian Psalter,* ed. David H. Wright, EEMF, Vol. 14 (Copenhagen, 1967), pp. 52–53; James Mearns, *The Canticles of the Christian Church, Eastern and Western, in Early and Medieval Times* (Cambridge, 1914), pp. 51–53; Dom Fernand Cabrol in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (Paris, 1907–53) (henceforth cited as *DACL*), Vol. II, pt. 2, cols. 1975–94, under "Cantiques." For commentary on the canticle see, in addition to Bede, Jerome *Commentarium in Abacuc Prophetam ad Chromatium,* in his *Commentarii in Prophetas Minores,* ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL, Vol. 76A (Turnhout, 1970), at pp. 618–54 (cf. *PL,* 25:815–1578); and the fragmentary commentary by Verecundus Iuncensis, *Commentarii super Cantica Ecclesiastica, VI, Habbacuc,* in *Verecundi Iuncensis Opera,* ed. R. Demeulenaere, in CCSL, Vol. 93 (Turnhout, 1976), pp. 124–47 (the beginning is missing, including the commentary on Verses 1–3).

22. John Walton Tyrer, *Historical Survey of Holy Week, Its Services and Ceremonial,* Alcuin Club Collections, 29 (Oxford, 1932), pp. 118–42. For the time of the service at Rome, from the seventh century onwards, see the Gelasian Sacramentary, in Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, ed., *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aecclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli,* Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior: Fontes, 4 (Rome, 1960), p. 64, par. 395. The ceremony was held at the ninth hour, at Rome, from the seventh to the fifteenth centuries: see Ludwig Eisenhofer and Joseph Lechner, *The Liturgy of the Roman Rite* (Edinburgh and London, 1961), p. 197; earlier, it had been held at the third hour (9 A.M.), the time at which, according to St. Mark (15:25) Jesus was nailed to the Cross (Tyrer, p. 120). For the ninth hour as the time of Christ's death in the synoptics, see Matthew 27:46; Mark 15:34; Luke 23:44. The third, sixth and ninth hours were traditional Jewish times for prayer; and it has been argued that the indications of time in the Passion narratives themselves originated in the earliest Christian liturgies commemorating the Passion. As Michael D. Goulder has put it, "the Gospel was born from the womb of the liturgy" (*The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* [London, 1978], pp. 296–305 [at p. 297]); see also Etienne Trocmé, *The Passion as Liturgy: A Study in the Origin of the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (London, 1983).

23. Tyrer, p. 120; Michel Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge,* 5 vols.,

Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Vols. 11, 23, 24, 28, and 29 (Louvain, 1931–61), Ordo XXIII, Nos. 17–18 (Vol. III, p. 271) and Ordo XXIV, No. 24 (Vol. III, p. 292). For full texts of the Good Friday responsories, see René Hesbert, No. 78a, pp. 94–95.

24. Jerome *Commentarium in Abacuc*, p. 621; cf. *PL*, 25:1309D. For the date of Jerome's commentary on Habbakuk, see J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies* (London, 1975), pp. 159 and 163.

25. Bede *Expositio ... in Canticum Abacuc*, p. 383; cf. *PL*, 91:1238.

26. Hesbert, p. lix. This use of Psalm 90 on Good Friday is attested by the older Roman *ordines:* see Andrieu, Ordo XXIII, No. 18 (Vol. III, p. 271). Amalarius of Metz, who did not himself use the *Qui habitat* in the Good Friday ceremonies, nevertheless recorded that its use on Good Friday was "iuxta morem antiquum Romanae ecclesiae" (*De Ordine Antiphonarii*, Chap. 7 [cf. *PL*, 105:1260A]), as quoted by Andrieu, Vol. III, p. 271, note.

27. Jerome *Commentarium in Abacuc*, p. 621.

28. Verses 8–9 of the Canticle of Habbakuk, and their interpretation by Jerome and Bede, seem of the greatest relevance for understanding why, on the south side of the Ruthwell Cross, an archer is depicted directly over the heads of Saints Martha and Mary. I develop this idea in a forthcoming paper on the spiritual program of the south side of the cross. The phrase "in medio duorum animalium" seems to be referred to widely (usually in eucharistic contexts) in Pictish and Irish high crosses: see my forthcoming paper, "The Meeting of St. Paul and St. Anthony: Visual and Literary Uses of a Eucharistic Theme (on the Ruthwell Cross, Pictish and Irish Monuments; in the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* and Adomnán's *Vita Columbae*)," in *Keimalia: Studies in Archaeology and History in Memory of Tom Delaney*, ed. Gearóid Mac Niocaill and Patrick Wallace (Galway: Galway University Press, 1985).

29. Vespasian Psalter, ed. Sweet, p. 407.

30. John 9:4–5.

31. See *DACL*, Vol. XII, Pt. 2, cols. 2665–69, under "Orientation"; the earthly paradise and Christ coming from the East in judgment are discussed at col. 2667; Louis Gougaud, "Eastward Position in Prayer," *Devotional and Ascetic Practices in the Middle Ages* (London, 1927), pp. 44–50. For recent bibliography, see Frank Leslie Cross and E. A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1978), p. 1008, under "Orientation."

32. E. Bishop, "The Litany of the Saints in the Stowe Missal," *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918), pp. 137–64, at pp. 143, 147–48. On the various devotional perspectives within which the "Agnus Dei" can be seen, see Elisabeth Okasha and Jennifer O'Reilly, "An Anglo-Saxon Portable Altar: Inscription and Iconography," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 47 (1984), 32–51. I am grateful to these scholars for allowing me to consult this article before its publication.

33. See É. Ó Carragáin, "Liturgical Innovations Associated with Pope Sergius and the Iconography of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses," in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Farrell, pp. 131–47, at pp. 134–37.

34. Andrieu, Vol. II, p. 49; on the Syrian origin of such devotion, and hence the importance of the Syrian Pope Sergius I in its introduction into the Roman liturgy, see Josef A. Jungmann, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer* (London and Dublin, 1965), pp. 259–63. In my "Liturgical Innovations" article (p. 139) I incorrectly stated that Sergius was appointed "prior cantorum" before he became pope. This was based on a misunderstanding of the *Liber Pontificalis*, which in fact states that Sergius had been placed under the direction of the Prior (for instruction in chant): "et quia studiosus erat et capax in officio cantelenae, priori cantorum pro doctrina est traditus" (Louis Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, with additions and corrections by Cyrille Vogel, 3 vols. [rpt. Paris, 1981], I, 371).

35. Okasha, p. 110.

36. For the three stages of the proclamation, see John, 1:19 ff., 29 ff. and 35 ff.

37. Bede *Homiliarum Evangelii Libri II*, Book I, Homily 15 (ed. Hurst, pp. 105–10). Hurst points out (note on p. 105) that Bede is here following the Romano-Neapolitan use reflected in the Lindisfarne Gospels, in which John 1:29–35 is the lection for the first Sunday after Epiphany.

38. Bede *Homiliarum Evangelii Libri II* (ed. Hurst, pp. 105–06, ll. 18–28). See Willis, p. 221. In the "Agnus Dei" chant, the plural variant "peccata mundi" was modeled on the *Gloria* chant, which has the phrase, "qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis"; see *DACL*, Vol. I, col. 966, under "Agnus Dei."

39. This passage, and other eucharistic references in Bede, are discussed by X. le Bachelet, "Le Vénérable Bède témoin de la foi eucharistique dans l'Eglise anglo-saxonne," *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Eucharistic Congress* (London, 1909), pp. 311–26.

40. See Louis Gougaud, "Les Rites de la consécration et de la fraction dans la liturgie celtique de la Messe," *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Eucharistic Congress* (London, 1909), pp. 348–61, at pp. 352–53.

41. Luke 24:30–31.

42. G. F. Warner, ed., *The Stowe Missal*, 2 vols., Henry Bradshaw Society, Vols. 31–32 (London, 1906–15), I, 34^{r}; II, 17.

43. Matthew 2:15, which refers to Hosea 11:1; see Henderson, forthcoming paper.

44. On the Ruthwell Cross as at present reconstructed, this figure has been reversed mistakenly, and is now on the south side.

45. See Rosemary Cramp, "The Evangelist Symbols and Their Parallels in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture," in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Farrell, pp. 118–30.

46. As suggested by Meyvaert, "An Apocalypse Panel"; but see Henderson's forthcoming paper.

47. 1 Corinthians 11:26–29. 1 Corinthians 11:26–32 is given as a reading for Mass in the Stowe Missal, ed. Warner, Vol. I, fol. 15^{r-v}; Vol. II, p. 5. Saxl (p. 4) has already emphasized how relevant to the Ruthwell iconography are the eschatological dimensions of the Eucharist.

48. Stowe Missal, ed. Warner, Vol. I, fol. 28^{r-v}; Vol. II, p. 13.

49. Isaiah 43:20; Okasha, p. 110.

50. Gregory *Homiliarum in Evangelia Libri Duo* I.8, in *PL*, 76:1104B. Gregory is commenting on the ox and the ass at the manger in Bethlehem, in a sermon for Christmas morning. See also Bede, *Homeliarum Euangelii*, ed. Hurst, pp. 41–42.

51. Ó Carragáin, "Liturgical Innovations," p. 135.